

2004 / 2005 San Bernardino County Annual Survey



A subdivision of:



Co-Principal Investigators:

Shel Bockman, Barbara Sirotnik, and Christen Ruiz

THE 2004 / 2005 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY ANNUAL SURVEY

**We would like to thank the following organizations who
generously contributed to this survey:**

SPONSORS:

San Bernardino Associated Governments

BENEFACTORS:

Inland Empire United Way

Omnitrans

Jobs and Employment Services Department

AFFILIATES:

San Bernardino Economic Development Agency

Verizon

College of Business and Public Administration, CSUSB

INTRODUCTION

The Inland Empire Research Consortium (IERC), a subdivision of the Institute of Applied Research (IAR), is pleased to present the results of its **2004 / 2005 San Bernardino County Annual Survey** of residents in San Bernardino County. In previous years IERC has produced the *Inland Empire* Annual Survey, a survey of Riverside and San Bernardino County residents. For the past three years the survey has been limited to San Bernardino County and does not address public perceptions outside of the county.

The purpose of the **San Bernardino County Annual Survey** is to provide policy-related research that bears on issues important to San Bernardino County. The San Bernardino County Annual Survey provides decision-makers with objective, accurate and current information for:

- ◆ **evaluating key public and private sector services and activities** (e.g., retail services, health care, education, transportation);
- ◆ **describing the public's current views as well as changes over time** in public perceptions of such issues as: quality of life, the state of the local economy, perceptions of the region as a place to live and work, the greatest problems and issues (e.g., crime, pollution, immigration) facing San Bernardino County, commuting, traffic congestion, and promotion of economic development;
- ◆ **providing a regional focus** for the on-going discussion of key local/regional issues; and
- ◆ **disseminating a coherent picture of San Bernardino County residents' views, beliefs, and demographic characteristics** to key decision makers within and outside the county, thus enabling comparisons to other counties.

The San Bernardino Annual Survey also includes (on a space available basis), some *proprietary items* designed to meet specific information needs of some sponsors within San Bernardino County.

The IERC is a subdivision of the Institute of Applied Research and Policy Analysis at California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB). IERC is committed to promoting regionalism and cooperation, and to projecting the Inland Empire onto the radar screen of other “significant actors” in the State. It is our hope that the Annual Survey will, in future years, again

reflect the two-county area (rather than just San Bernardino County) and that it will continue to be a valuable area resource for initiating community discourse and helping to inform public policy, officials, and citizens by incorporating proprietary questions from public and private agencies in the two county area.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire items were selected on the following basis: Several questions were incorporated from previous annual surveys of Riverside and San Bernardino counties which were designed to track changes over time in the residents' perceptions about their quality of life and economic well-being, their views about the pressing issues of the day, and their ratings of public services and agencies. In addition, a number of standard demographic questions were included for tracking purposes and for cross tabulation of findings. Tracking questions, of course, provide public agencies and businesses with trend data often needed in policy making and outcome assessments. These questions are also valuable in comparing the county with other counties in the state and nation. A number of sponsors also submitted questions for their proprietary use. Finally, the researchers, in consultation with sponsors, also added questions concerning current issues which have policy and research implications. A draft copy of the questionnaire was submitted to the sponsors for their approval and modified where warranted. A Spanish version of the questionnaire was produced, the survey instrument was then pre-tested (both languages), and some minor changes to the wording and order of some items were made. The questionnaire is attached as Appendix I.

SAMPLING METHODS

As indicated earlier, this year's survey focused exclusively on residents within San Bernardino County. As part of this effort, SANBAG was also interested in region-specific differences within the county. Specifically, four regions of interest were defined: **East Valley**, **West Valley**, **Victor Valley**, and **Desert**. To ensure an acceptable level of accuracy of findings within each of the San Bernardino County regions (East Valley, West Valley, Desert, and Victor Valley), a sample size of at least 200 respondents per region was required, yielding a 95% level of confidence and an accuracy of +/- 7% per region. A total of 970 respondents within San

Bernardino County were interviewed, but the actual number of respondents per survey item varies depending on whether the item is a baseline question or a proprietary question. In any event, the level of accuracy for the combined regions exceeds +/- 3.5% for all baseline questions which are the focus of this countywide report.

Within each region, telephone survey respondents were randomly selected from a comprehensive sample frame consisting of all telephone working blocks which contain residential telephone numbers in the region. This is a standard random sampling approach for studies of this nature. Telephone interviews were conducted by the Institute of Applied Research at California State University, San Bernardino using computer assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) equipment and software. The surveys were conducted between March 8, 2005 and March 23, 2005. In the following table the list of cities from which respondents come are grouped by the four San Bernardino County study areas.

**Communities and Cities Mentioned by Respondents,
Broken Down By The Four Designated County Study Areas**

East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert Region
Big Bear Bloomington Colton Crestline Grand Terrace Highland Lake Arrowhead Loma Linda Lytle Creek Mentone Redlands Rialto Running Springs San Bernardino Yucaipa	Chino Chino Hills Fontana Montclair Ontario Rancho Cucamonga Upland	Adelanto Apple Valley Hesperia Lucerne Valley Victorville Wrightwood	Barstow Earp Hinkley Joshua Tree Landers Morongo Valley Needles Trona TwentyninePalms Yucca Valley

INTRODUCTION TO FINDINGS

Following are the major findings from this year's San Bernardino County Annual Survey. Findings are generally presented for San Bernardino County as a whole. In those few instances where there exist significant differences between the four regions, such dissimilarities will be noted and discussed in detail. In addition, this report now includes eight years of continuous data which provide an opportunity for trend analysis.

Finally, the tables in the data display and in the following sections of the report reflect a weighting scheme to correct for the over-sampling of certain geographic areas in the county mentioned above. Throughout this report, therefore, when we refer to the number of respondents indicating a particular view (a number that is a weighted figure), the actual number of respondents may differ from the adjusted figure reported in the table. For a full data display of countywide (weighted) findings, see Appendix II. Regional breakdowns are shown in Appendix III.

COMMUTING AND TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

OVERVIEW: Since the 1998 Annual Survey, the percentage of respondents with short commute times (less than 1 hour) has remained relatively stable, with a slight increasing trend. Most respondents from each zone spend less than an hour commuting to and from work. Over 70% work within San Bernardino County, with LA County being the second most "popular" county destination of choice.

The pattern of regional differences in commuting times (Question 25) has changed little from previous years (Table 1), with the Desert Region continuing to have the highest proportion of respondents with relatively short commute times (less than one hour). This figure is significantly higher than the proportion for the other regions (particularly Victor Valley).

For county-wide respondents as a group, the length of reported commuting times has remained fairly constant from year to year. In this year's survey almost two-thirds (64%) of San Bernardino County respondents reported having commuting times of less than one hour. This is an increase from the 58% with short commute times reported in the 1997 and 1998 surveys, and

the approximate 60 – 62% in 1999 – 2002. We noted in last year’s report that the overall trend of more people commuting less than 1 hour to work may be partially due to job creation taking place in the Inland Empire (especially the Desert region). This year’s findings are virtually the same (i.e. within the statistical margin of error) as last year’s, thus our conclusion still holds.

Table 1. % With Total Commuting Times of Less Than 1 Hour

	East Valley %	West Valley %	Victor Valley %	Desert %	San Bernardino County
1997 Survey	69	48	60	56	58
1998 Survey	60	54	58	71	58
1999 Survey	67	56	58	72	62
2000 Survey	68	59	43	76	61
2001 Survey	67	56	56	72	60
2002 Survey	61		55	69	61
2003 Survey	68	62	59	77	65
2004 / 05 Survey	64	65	55	72	64

Although a large majority of respondents report commuting a total of less than one hour each day, a significant number of respondents commute for longer times. Indeed, many San Bernardino County respondents commute for over two hours (14 % of East Valley, 12% of West Valley, 21% of Victor Valley, and 15% of Desert respondents). These long commuting times, of course, take a toll in terms of personal lifestyle, affecting family and social life, level of stress, and available time for leisure activities. In addition, there is obviously a financial cost involved, including costs for gas and auto maintenance.

The majority (71%) of those respondents who commute to work report that they travel to work within their own county (Question 27), with Los Angeles County being the number two destination (Table 2). This pattern has been noted in previous Annual Surveys and it continues this year.

**Table 2. County-Wide Respondents'
Commuting Destinations, 1998-2005***

Work Destination County	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004 / 2005
San Bernardino	72.5	73.3	70.1	69.3	67.0	69.2	70.6
Riverside	7.8	5.7	7.1	7.9	8.7	7.2	5.1
Orange	3.3	3.2	4.4	3.8	6.2	5.1	4.5
Los Angeles	13.5	14.8	15.3	16.1	16.1	15.6	15.9
San Diego	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.4
Other	2.6	2.5	2.5	1.9	1.4	2.4	3.3

*Numbers in cells are % of respondents.

The region-specific tables in the appendix show that the largest percentage of respondents commuting outside the county to work continue to be those residing in the West Valley (37.3%), while respondents least likely to travel outside the county to work reside in the Desert region (16.8%). While this trend is consistent with previous years, it is worth noting that the number of West Valley residents commuting outside the county to work is *down* from previous years and the number of residents in the Desert region who commute outside the county to work is *up* from previous years. As was the case last year, respondents traveling to Los Angeles County for work are much more likely to reside in the West Valley (26.1%) than in the other three regions combined (6.8% for East, 10.2% for Victor and none from the Desert region).

Although there are only slight percentage variations in work destination over time for the county as a whole and for each region, the bottom line is that in light of dramatically increasing population within the county, more and more county residents are on the roads each day trying to get to work. This has obvious and worrisome policy implications in that unless there is a dramatic increase in residents willing to carpool or utilize the public transportation system, San Bernardino County residents will continue to face an increasingly clogged freeway system and a local street system stressed beyond its capacity.

RATINGS OF THE COUNTY

OVERVIEW: *As in previous surveys, a substantial majority of San Bernardino County residents in each zone continue to rate their county as a good place to live. “General*

location” continues to be mentioned as the “best” thing about living in the county, while crime and smog continue to be mentioned as the predominant negatives.

As has been the case since the inception of the Annual Survey in 1997, the majority of residents rate San Bernardino County as a "fairly good" or "very good" place to live (Question 3).

Table 3. Ratings of San Bernardino County as a Place to Live

RATING	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
Very good	13.0%	31.2%	21.4%	25.8%	22.6%
Fairly good	46.1%	46.2%	53.7%	53.0%	47.6%
Neither good nor bad	23.2%	17.3%	17.0%	15.2%	19.4%
Fairly bad	11.0%	3.8%	6.1%	3.2%	6.9%
Very bad	6.7%	1.5%	1.7%	2.8%	3.6%

Since the inception of the survey in 1997, the highest ranking has come from the West Valley zone (see Table 4 below). This year, however, we see that the Desert region received the highest ranking, up 13% from last year. Although many factors may have played a part in the improved ratings, it is worth noting that a similar shift was noted in Desert respondents' perceptions of the health of the area economy (reported on in a later section). The ratings in 2004 / 2005 have improved from the 1997 ratings in all zones, but especially in the Victor Valley and Desert regions.

Table 4. Trend -- Proportion of Respondents Indicating Their County Is A "Very Good" or "Fairly Good" Place to Live

	East Valley %	West Valley %	Victor Valley %	Desert %
1997 Survey	50	76	67	63
1998 Survey	58	76	66	69
1999 Survey	59	78	71	64
2000 Survey	55	77	73	63
2001 Survey	65	77	77	69
2002 Survey	73		75	68
2003 Survey	61	81	75	66
2004 / 2005 Survey	59	77	75	79

To help place the above findings in perspective, respondents were asked to indicate the one BEST and one MOST NEGATIVE thing about living in the county (Questions 4 and 5). San Bernardino County residents continue to cite the general area/location/scenery as the most positive aspect of living in the county, although the percent of respondents mentioning this has declined over the last three years. Climate / weather and affordable housing are also mentioned by many respondents (Table 5).

Table 5. Positive Factors Mentioned About the County

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	2002 SB County	2003 SB County	2004 / 05 SB County
Good area, location, scenery	31.2%	34.2%	25.7%	22.5%	41 %	39%	31 %
Good Climate, weather	15.6%	12.3%	25.7%	29.4%	9%	15%	16%
Affordable housing	9.7%	13.6%	13.8%	4.3%	13%	12%	12%
Not crowded	3.8%	9.9%	12.8%	18.7%	10%	9%	8%

For the third year in a row, crime and gang activity has surpassed smog/air pollution as the most often mentioned negative factor, particularly in the East Valley and Victor Valley. Residents of the West Valley mentioned the traffic and smog as the most negative factors about living in the county. Although East Valley, West Valley and Victor Valley respondents noted crime/gang activity, smog/air pollution, traffic, and lack of job opportunities as the most negative factors, Desert respondents differed. For Desert respondents, roads were rated as the most negative factor (by 10% of respondents), followed closely by lack of job opportunities and bad location (9%), followed by the 8% concerned about crime and gangs (as noted below).

Table 6. Negative Factors Mentioned About the County

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	2002 SB County	2003 SB County	2004 / 05 SB County
Crime, gang activity	31%	16%	20%	8%	19%	20%	22%
Smog, air pollution	15%	17%	6%	3%	14%	14%	14%
Traffic	11%	17%	14%	4%	11%	10%	14%
Lack of job opportunity/ Economy	2%	3%	4%	9%	7%	4%	3%

It is important to note that “drug problems” continue to be mentioned by respondents in each of the four zones as a negative factor about living in San Bernardino County. When it is combined with “crime and gang activity” it is clear that this is a problem which policy makers must continue to address. While it is encouraging that, overall, the percentages mentioning crime as a negative factor have not significantly changed since last year’s survey, it is worth noting that the percentage of respondents in the Victor Valley region who mentioned crime as the most negative factor *increased* from only 7% last year to 20% this year.

In the 1999 report, we had noted that smog/air pollution had dramatically disappeared as a highly salient negative thing about county life in the minds of respondents. In 2000 it returned as a pressing concern in two of the four zones (East and West Valley). For the past four years it appears to be a concern in *all* zones, and the figures for all zones are relatively unchanged from the 2001 survey.

Table 7.
% Mentioning Smog as a Negative Factor

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert
1997 Survey	14%	19%	5%	2%
1998 Survey	11%	15%	7%	3%
1999 Survey	0%	2%	0%	0%
2000 Survey	16%	15%	3%	1%
2001 Survey	17%	17%	8%	6%
2002 Survey	16%		7%	7%
2003 Survey	14%	16%	9%	5%
2004 / 05 Survey	15%	17%	6%	3%

FEAR OF CRIME AND CRIME RELATED ISSUES

OVERVIEW: *Fear among San Bernardino County residents of being the victim of a serious crime is slightly on the rise from previous years, with a significant increase in the level of fear among Victor Valley residents.*

In 2001 we reported a dramatic decrease in the percentage of San Bernardino County residents who reported being “very” or “somewhat” fearful of being the victim of a serious crime. However, it appears that this fear may be on the rise again. When the question was asked

directly: “how fearful are you that you will be a victim of a serious crime, such as a violent or costly crime” (Question 9), 41% of county residents express that they are either “very fearful” or “somewhat fearful” (slightly up from 39% last year).

Table 8.
% “Very Fearful” or “Somewhat Fearful” of being the victim of a serious crime

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	46%	41%	40%	36%	43%
1998 Survey	48%	38%	33%	20%	40%
1999 Survey	38%	36%	37%	23%	36%
2000 Survey	48%	39%	33%	24%	41%
2001 Survey	35%	32%	25%	21%	32%
2002 Survey	35%		34%	26%	35%
2003 Survey	44%	38%	29%	29%	39%
2004 / 05 Survey	48%	35%	44%	28%	41%

It is difficult to interpret the trend (if any) over time in fear of crime. From one point of view, it might appear that the 41% in 2000 was an anomaly, and indeed the fear had been decreasing and is now rising again. From another point of view, one could review the 7 years of data and conclude that there has been no real overall trend...rather there has been significant variability in terms of precise percentages of those people fearful of being a victim of crime. Regardless of point of view, perhaps the most important point to emphasize is that over the past seven years, approximately 4 in 10 people have been seriously concerned about being the victim of a serious crime.

Which regions’ respondents hold the most fear of crime? The trend for most of the historical data shown below is that East and West Valley respondents have expressed a higher level of fear of being the victim of a serious crime than respondents in the Victor Valley and the Desert regions. This year, however, there is a significant increase in the number of Victor Valley residents saying they are afraid of being the victim of a serious crime (up 15% from last year), even surpassing the fear among West Valley residents. One possible explanation for this significant increase is that in 2004 there was a high profile local murder case which reached the court system and was extensively discussed in area newspapers. This may have skewed respondents’ perceptions of the amount of crime in the area, and may also explain the above

findings that crime and gang activity were rated as the most important negative factor about living in the region. In any event, next year's survey results should help clarify whether this year's findings are the start of an increasing trend of fear in the Victor Valley or simply a function of media attention (which might dissipate over time).

ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

OVERVIEW: While perceptions of the county's economy are slightly on the rise from last year, respondents rated their own personal financial well-being about the same as it was a year ago. The big new, however, is that they remain optimistic about their future financial well-being.

Although there has been an ebb and flow in public evaluation about the state of the county's economy, over time nearly half of county respondents rate the economy as "excellent" or "good." This year's data is no exception. County-wide, perceptions of the economy improved 7% from last year (Question #8).

When looking at regional differences, it is interesting to note that respondents in the West Valley and Victor Valley continue to hold the strongest ratings of the county's economy, whereas respondents in the East Valley and Desert regions hold significantly lower evaluations of the state of the economy. It should be noted, however, that the ratings in East Valley, West Valley, and the Desert have increased significantly over last year's ratings.

Table 9.
% Rating the County's Economy as "Excellent" or "Good"

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	20%	46%	14%	24%	28%
1998 Survey	39%	56%	33%	39%	45%
1999 Survey	35%	62%	39%	39%	47%
2000 Survey	39%	51%	37%	37%	44%
2001 Survey	32%	46%	41%	27%	39%
2002 Survey	46%		27%	26%	43%
2003 Survey	26%	49%	46%	25%	39%
2004 / 05 Survey	37%	55%	43%	40%	46%

There are several other indicators of county economic well-being in this study which

cloud the picture slightly. As was the case last year, respondents offered perceptions about their own *personal* economic well-being, and these were not necessarily consistent with their ratings of the county economy. Responding to the question “In comparison to a year ago, would you say that you and your family are better off, worse off, or the same” (Question 6) the percentage of respondents reporting being "better off" when compared with a year before is virtually unchanged from the ratings last year.

Table 10.
% Indicating Their Finances Are "Better Off" Compared With a Year Ago

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
1997 Survey	39%	38%	28%	22%	34%
1998 Survey	44%	52%	38%	35%	46%
1999 Survey	38%	48%	35%	38%	42%
2000 Survey	38%	44%	42%	40%	41%
2001 Survey	35%	42%	36%	36%	38%
2002 Survey	30%		24%	32%	30%
2003 Survey	35%	36%	33%	33%	35%
2004 / 05 Survey	35%	33%	35%	32%	34%

Further, when the respondents were asked to project to the future (“Now looking ahead, do you think that a year from now you and your family will be better off, worse off, or just about the same as you are now”) respondents in each zone appeared to remain optimistic about their own finances (Question 7). Indeed, the percentage expecting to be “better off” in terms of their family finances a year from now ranged from a high of 49% in the West Valley to the low of 38% in the Desert. These findings are consistent with those in previous years which indicate that people tend to be optimistic about the future regarding their finances, even if they are less than pleased with their current economic state.

EVALUATIONS OF SELECTED PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SERVICES

OVERVIEW: *Ratings of private and public services have not changed significantly over time in the county overall, with high marks continuing to be given to Police/Sheriff services, shopping, and parks/recreation services. On the other end of the continuum, street/road maintenance, transportation, and public schools continue to be problem areas.*

Each year the Annual Survey includes questions regarding respondents' evaluations of local services from both the private and public sectors. Over time, there has been remarkable stability in rankings. The following table details the percentage of respondents who indicate that the services are "excellent" or "good" (Questions 14 to 20).

Table 11.
Trends in "Excellent" or "Good" Ratings of Services

SERVICE	1997 Annual Survey	1998 Annual Survey	1999 Annual Survey	2000 Annual Survey	2001 Annual Survey	2002 Annual Survey	2003 Annual Survey	2004 / 2005 Annual Survey
Shopping	N/A	65%	68%	63%	68%	70%	66%	66%
Police/Sheriff	66%	65%	70%	64%	66%	71%	69%	63%
Parks/Recreation	56%	56%	60%	58%	58%	58%	56%	55%
Entertainment	N/A	50%	49%	43%	46%	49%	49%	46%
Public Schools	47%	51%	46%	41%	45%	51%	46%	37%
Transportation	N/A	N/A	N/A	36%	42%	40%	38%	36%
Streets/Roads	26%	35%	38%	33%	34%	39%	35%	25%

* The percent of respondents indicating "Don't know" was especially high for ratings of public schools (14%) and local transportation (17%), thus the low ratings for these services must be placed in that context.

In previous years, county respondents have given the highest ranking to police/sheriff services, with evaluations of shopping falling close behind. This year shopping was rated higher than police/sheriff (largely due to increased ratings in the West Valley – see below). Streets and roads have always been a problem area, and remain so this year. In addition, over the past few years we had noted an improvement in rankings of the county public school system. But this year the percentage of respondents rating public schools as "excellent" or "good" declined, and is now "on par" with the low ratings given to local transportation.

Table 13 below shows the regional breakdowns of ratings in services. In that table, it becomes clear that police/sheriff services were the highest rated of all services in three out of four regions, with West Valley being the exception.

Since the inception of these reports, street and road maintenance has consistently ranked the lowest of all services under evaluation. What is particularly disturbing in this year's report is the erosion in perceptions among East and West Valley residents. In addition, in the 2002 report we noted that "the problems with street and road maintenance appear to be especially severe (from the respondents' perception) in the Victor Valley and Desert regions," yet figures have

continued to drop in the Victor Valley region. The figures in the Desert region have remained relatively stable.

Table 12.
% Rating Local Services as “Excellent” or “Good”

	East Valley	West Valley	Victor Valley	Desert	SB County
Shopping	57%	80%	57%	36%	66%
Police/Sheriff	60%	68%	59%	53%	63%
Parks/Recreation	47%	65%	47%	54%	55%
Entertainment	37%	59%	34%	28%	46%
Public Schools	34%	40%	35%	41%	37%
Local Transportation	37%	38%	27%	41%	36%
Street/Road Maintenance -- 2004	17%	35%	13%	22%	25%
Street/Road Maintenance -- 2003	27%	50%	16%	23%	35%
Street/Road Maintenance -- 2002	43%		21%	25%	39%

FINAL NOTE

In this report we have presented countywide and region-specific findings from the 2004 / 2005 San Bernardino County Annual Survey. The reader is encouraged to review the full data displays (attached) for the complete listing of survey results. This report will be added to previous Annual Surveys on our web site (<http://iar.csusb.edu>) for those who wish to engage in more detailed comparative analysis with previous years' reports.

For questions about the San Bernardino County Annual Survey (or additional analysis tailored to a particular organization or agency), please contact the authors: Shel Bockman (909-880-5733), Barbara Sirotnik (909-880-5729), or Christen Ruiz (909-473-8312).

APPENDIX I

Questionnaire

SAN BERNARDINO ANNUAL SURVEY, 2004/5

- SHELLO Hello, I am calling from the Institute of Applied Research at Cal State San Bernardino.
- SHEAD Are you the head of this household or his or her spouse?
1. Yes [SKIP TO INTRO]
 2. No [CONTINUE]
 3. DON'T KNOW/NO RESPONSE
 4. REFUSED
- SHEAD2 Is the head of the household or his or her spouse at home?
1. Yes [SKIP TO INTRO]
 2. No [CONTINUE]
 3. DON'T KNOW/NO RESPONSE
 4. REFUSED
- INTRO California State University San Bernardino is conducting a scientific study of public opinion on a variety of issues. Answers to this survey will be used by county officials to make policy decisions and your opinions are very important to represent your point of view in our study. This survey takes about 10 minutes to complete. Your identity and your responses will remain completely anonymous and confidential, and of course, you are free to decline to answer any particular survey question.
- I should also mention that this call may be monitored by my supervisor for quality control purposes only. Is it alright to ask you these questions now?
1. YES [SKIP TO BEGIN]
 2. NO [SKIP TO APPT]
- AGEQAL First, I'd like to verify that you are at least 18 years of age.
1. Yes [SKIP TO BEGIN]
 2. No
- QSORRY I'm sorry, but currently we are interviewing people 18 years of age and older. Thank you for your time. [TERMINATE INTERVIEW]
- APPT Is it possible to make an appointment to ask you the survey questions at a more convenient time?
1. Yes (SPECIFY)_____
 2. No
- BEGIN I'd like to begin by asking you some general questions.

- COUNTY First, I'd like to verify that you currently live in San Bernardino County. Is that correct?
1. Yes
 2. No [TERMINATE INTERVIEW]
1. What city do you live in?
 1. Code directly _____
 2. DON'T KNOW
 3. REFUSED
 2. What is your zip code?
 1. Code directly _____
 2. DON'T KNOW
 3. REFUSED
 3. Overall, how would you rate San Bernardino County as a place to live? Would you say it is Very Good, Fairly Good, Neither Good Nor Bad, Fairly Bad, or Very Bad?
 1. Very good
 2. Fairly good
 3. Neither good nor bad
 4. Fairly bad
 5. Very bad
 6. DON'T KNOW
 7. REFUSED

ROTATE THE FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS (B4 and B5)

4. In your opinion, what is the ONE best thing about living in San Bernardino County?
[INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ OPTIONS]
 1. Good area, location, scenery
 2. Affordable housing
 3. Good climate, weather
 4. Not crowded
 5. Good schools/universities
 6. Less crime, feel safe
 7. Job availability
 8. Friendly people
 666. Other SPECIFY _____
 777. NOTHING
 888. DON'T KNOW
 999. REFUSED

5. In your opinion, what would you say is the ONE most negative thing about living in San Bernardino County? **[INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ OPTIONS]**
1. Smog, air pollution
 2. Traffic
 3. Poor public transportation
 4. Drugs
 5. Crime/Gang activity
 6. Bad location
 7. Lack of entertainment
 8. Overpopulated
 9. Bad school system
 10. Cost of living
 11. Lack of job opportunity
 666. Other SPECIFY _____
 777. NOTHING
 888. DON'T KNOW
 999. REFUSED
6. In comparison to a year ago, would you say that you and your family are financially better off or worse off or the same?
1. Better off
 2. Same
 3. Worse off
 4. DON'T KNOW
 5. REFUSE
7. Now looking ahead, do you think that a year from now you and your family will be better off, worse off, or just about the same as you are now?
1. Better off
 2. Same
 3. Worse off
 4. DON'T KNOW
 5. REFUSE
8. In general, how would you rate the economy in San Bernardino County today? Would you say that it is Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor?
1. Excellent
 2. Good
 3. Fair
 4. Poor
 5. DON'T KNOW
 6. REFUSED

9. In general, how fearful are you that you will be the victim of a serious crime, such as a violent or costly crime? Would you say that you are...
1. Very fearful
 2. Somewhat fearful
 3. Not too fearful, or . . .
 4. Not at all fearful
 5. DON'T KNOW
 6. REFUSED

TRANS: I would now like to ask you some questions about voting.

10. Are you currently registered to vote?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. DON'T KNOW
 4. REFUSED TO ANSWER
11. Which of the following best describes your political party affiliation: Democrat, Republican, Independent, or some other party?
1. Democrat
 2. Republican
 3. Independent
 4. Some other Party
 5. None
 6. DON'T KNOW
 7. REFUSED TO ANSWER
12. Would you say that you vote in all elections, only some, hardly ever or never?
1. In all elections
 2. Only in some
 3. Hardly ever
 4. Never
 5. DON'T KNOW
 6. REFUSED
13. Politically, do you consider yourself to be..... **INTERVIEWER: READ OPTIONS**
1. Very liberal
 2. Somewhat liberal
 3. Middle of the road
 4. Somewhat conservative
 5. Very conservative
 6. DON'T KNOW
 7. REFUSED

(TRANS) Now, I'd like to ask you how you rate some of the local public and private services you are supposed to receive. For each would you let me know if you believe the service is excellent, good, fair, or poor. **(ROTATE B14 – B20)**

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>DON'T KNOW</u>	<u>REFUSE</u>
14. Police/Sheriff	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Parks and Recreation	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. The way streets and roads are kept up	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Public schools	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Shopping	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Entertainment	1	2	3	4	5	6

21. Are you currently employed?

1. Yes [SKIP TO 23]
2. No
3. REFUSED

22. **ASK IF CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED:** Are you retired, or looking for work, or a housewife or husband not looking for work outside the home, or not currently in the workforce?

1. Retired
2. Looking for work
3. A housewife/househusband and not looking for work outside the home; or
4. Not currently in workforce
5. REFUSED

SKIP TO QUESTION #30

23. Do you work full time or part time?

1. Full time
2. Part time
3. REFUSED

24. What is your occupation? Specify _____

25. When thinking about your travel to and from work, on the average, how much total time, **in minutes**, do you spend commuting **round trip** each day?

[INTERVIEWER: CODE # MINUTES]

777. Doesn't apply; don't work outside home or I am not employed
888. DON'T KNOW
999. REFUSED

26. How many miles roundtrip do you travel to work each day? [INTERVIEWER: EMPHASIZE "MILES" SO THEY KNOW THIS IS A DIFFERENT QUESTION THAN #25] [INTERVIEWER: ENTER # OF MILES]
888. DON'T KNOW
999. REFUSED
27. What county do you work in?
1. Riverside
2. San Bernardino
3. Orange
4. Los Angeles
5. San Diego
6. Other: _____
7. DON'T KNOW
8. REFUSED

Proprietary sponsor questions #28-42

UNITED WAY QUESTIONS

43. The next few questions ask about human service agencies such as those that provide assistance for food, shelter, mental health, etc. Did you or anyone in your household look for help from a human service agency in San Bernardino County during the past year?
1. Yes
2. No **SKIP TO QUESTION #47**
3. DON'T KNOW **SKIP TO QUESTION #47**
4. REFUSED **SKIP TO QUESTION #47**
44. [IF "YES" TO QUESTION #43] Did you get any help?
1. Yes **SKIP TO QUESTION #46**
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW **SKIP TO QUESTION #46**
4. REFUSED **SKIP TO QUESTION #46**

45. [IF “NO” TO QUESTION #44] Why not?
[INTERVIEWER: Do not read these responses, just check the box for every reason the respondent mentions:]
1. Did not like programs or services offered
 2. Was not eligible at place where help was sought
 3. Could not afford fees
 4. Lacked transportation
 5. Lacked child care/baby sitter
 6. Had problems with the English language
 7. Hours were not convenient
 8. The service did not have funding to assist me
 9. They didn’t have services I need -- they referred me to another agency
 10. They didn’t have the service I need – no referral offered
 11. Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)_____
 98. DON’T KNOW
 99. REFUSED

SKIP TO QUESTION #47 AFTER ANSWERING “WHY NOT”

46. [IF “YES” TO QUESTION #44] How did you hear about the agency? [INTERVIEWER: DON’T READ...JUST CHECK ONE]
1. Friend or family
 2. Referred from another social service agency
 3. Referred by a doctor
 4. Referred by clergy
 5. Looked in the phone book
 6. Internet
 7. Newspaper
 8. Radio
 9. Other (PLEASE SPECIFY)_____
 98. DON’T KNOW
 99. REFUSED

OMNITRANS QUESTIONS

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ONLY TO BE ASKED IN SELECTED ZIP CODES:

TRANS. Now I'm going to ask a few questions about bus service.

47. What is the name of your local bus service provider? [INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ...THEY CAN CHECK MULTIPLE OPTIONS]

1. Omnitrans (or Omni) (**SKIP QUESTION #48**)
2. OmniLink
3. (Redlands) Trolley
4. Access
5. MTA/RTD
6. Foothill
7. MARTA
8. VVTA
9. OCTA
10. other (SPECIFY) _____
11. DON'T KNOW
12. REFUSED

48. Have you heard of Omnitrans?

1. Yes
2. No
3. DON'T KNOW
4. REFUSED

49. On a scale of 1 to 7 with 1 meaning very poor and 7 meaning excellent, how would you rate your overall perception of Omnitrans/your local bus service, even if you have never used it personally? [NOTE: SAY "OMNITRANS" IF THEY HAVE HEARD OF IT (QUESTION#48) or "YOUR LOCAL BUS SERVICE" IF THEY ANSWERED NO, DON'T KNOW, OR REFUSED TO QUESTION #48]

very poor

excellent

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
DON'T KNOW
REFUSED

IF THEY SAID "NO", "DON'T KNOW" OR "REFUSED" TO QUESTION #48, SKIP OUT OF OMNITRANS QUESTIONS

50. Have you seen or heard an advertisement for Omnitrans in the last 6 months?
1. yes
 2. no (SKIP TO QUESTION #52)
 3. DON'T KNOW (SKIP TO QUESTION #52)
 4. REFUSED (SKIP TO QUESTION #52)
51. Where was that? [INTERVIEWER: DON'T READ OPTIONS....CHECK ALL THAT ARE MENTIONED BY RESPONDENT]
1. TV
 2. radio
 3. newspaper
 4. direct mail
 5. bill board
 6. ad on outside of bus
 7. bus shelter
 8. other (SPECIFY) _____

Proprietary sponsor Questions #52-57

(TRANS) And finally I'd like to ask a few questions about you and your background...

58. Which of the following best describes your marital status?
1. Single, never married
 2. Married
 3. Divorced
 4. Widowed
 5. REFUSED
59. Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. DON'T KNOW
 4. REFUSED
60. How would you describe your race or ethnicity?
- SELECT ALL THAT APPLY**
1. Asian (Specify)
 2. Black or African American
 3. Caucasian or White
 4. Other (Specify)
 5. Don't Know
 6. Refused

61. What was the last grade of school that you completed?
1. Some high school or less
 2. High school graduate
 3. Some college
 4. College graduate (Bachelor's degree)
 5. Some graduate work
 6. Post-graduate degree
 7. DON'T KNOW
 8. REFUSED
62. How many cars do you have for your household? ____ cars
63. What was your age at your last birthday? _____ Years
64. How long have you lived in San Bernardino County? _____ Years (ROUND UP)
65. Which of the following categories best describes your total household or family income before taxes, from all sources, for 2004?
1. Less than \$25,000
 2. \$25,000 to \$35,999
 3. \$36,000 to \$49,999
 4. \$50,000 to \$65,999
 5. \$66,000 to \$79,999
 6. \$80,000 to \$110,000
 7. Over \$110,000
 8. DON'T KNOW
 9. REFUSED

Well, that's it. Thank you very much for your time - we appreciate it.

INTERVIEWER QUESTIONS

- IQ1. The respondent was...
1. Male
 2. Female
 3. Couldn't tell
- IQ2. How cooperative was the respondent?
1. Cooperative
 2. Uncooperative
 3. Very Uncooperative
- IQ3. How well did the respondent understand the questions?
1. Very easily
 2. Easily
 3. Some difficulty
 4. Great deal of difficulty
- IQ4. In what language was the interview conducted?
1. English
 2. Spanish

APPENDIX II

County-Wide Data Display
Coming soon

APPENDIX III

Data Display
Regional Breakdown
Coming soon